

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**  
**(Docket No. 01-1014)**

<b>In re Application of:</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Edward P. Campbell and</b>	)	
<b>Michael S. Borella</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Serial No.: 09/998,819</b>	)	<b>Examiner: Adnan M. Mirza</b>
	)	
<b>Filed: October 25, 2001</b>	)	
	)	<b>Group Art Unit: 2145</b>
<b>Confirmation No. 5915</b>	)	
	)	
<b>For: System and Method for Session</b>	)	
<b>Control in a Mobile Internet</b>	)	
<b>Protocol Network</b>	)	

Mail Stop AF  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313

**REASONS FOR REVIEW OF FINAL REJECTION**

Applicants request review of the final rejection mailed January 15, 2008, because the Office Action has not set forth a sufficient basis for rejecting any of the claims. In the Office Action, all pending claims, 1-2, 4-6, 8-11, 13-15, 17-19, 21-23, and 25-26, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,490,624 (Sampson) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,546,425 (Hanson).

Applicants respectfully invite the panel to review the remarks set forth in Applicants' response filed October 26, 2007, where Applicants amended the pending claims and explained why the proposed combination of Sampson and Hanson would not logically result in the claims

as amended. Applicants submit that the Office Action mailed on January 15, 2008 is in error because it fails to cite references that teach the claimed matter.

The claimed matter is directed to controlling voice over IP communication sessions in mobile networks with multi-channel wireless air interfaces. The claims recite methods and systems where a mobile device is engaged in a first voice over IP communication session using a channel of an air interface; a request to accept a second voice over IP communication session is detected; and then, upon accepting the request for the second voice over IP communication session, the first voice over IP communication session is put on hold (or suspended) at a serving node and the second voice over IP communication session uses the same channel of the air interface.

Sampson teaches an architecture that manages sessions of the world-wide web protocol, HTTP. A remote user first accesses one of potentially many authentication servers. If the user's session is deemed valid, the authentication server allows the user to access an appropriate set of information on one or more protected servers. The HTTP sessions are managed by session managers, and these HTTP session managers execute in accordance with the authentication servers. Sampson primarily teaches methods of managing the redundancy of these HTTP session managers. Sampson fails to teach any aspect of communication session management that utilizes the specific nature of wireless air interfaces or voice over IP.

Hanson teaches a mobile proxy server that exists between mobile nodes and their correspondent nodes. Rather than require each mobile node to communicate directly with its correspondent node, the mobile proxy server breaks the communication sessions into two parts. Between the mobile node and the mobile proxy server, the communication uses the so-called Internet Mobility Protocol. This protocol uses Remote Procedure Call (RPC), a well-known

application layer protocol, and multiplexes all individual communications sessions between the mobile node and proxy server into a single application-layer channel. Like Sampson, Hanson fails to teach any aspect of communication session management that utilizes the specific nature of various wireless air interfaces or voice over IP.

The previous Office Action, mailed June 29, 2007, rejected all pending claims as being unpatentable over the combination of Sampson and Hanson. Applicants overcame these references by amending the claimed matter to recite elements that are not found Sampson or Hanson, and that do not logically or reasonable follow from the combination of Sampson and Hanson. The final Office Action mailed on January 15, 2008 implicitly acknowledged Applicants' claim amendments by adding the language of the claim amendments to what is substantially the same grounds for rejection that was set forth in the Office Action mailed June 29, 2007.

However, the elements that were added to the claims and subsequently copied into the Office Action mailed on January 15, 2008 are not found in nor implied by the cited references. For example, claim 1 as amended in Applicants' response filed October 26, 2007 now recites the element of "establishing a first voice over IP communication session at a client device over an air interface channel, wherein the air interface comprises multiple channels." (Amendments underlined.) The cited references do not teach voice over IP, nor do they teach an air interface comprising multiple channels. Furthermore, the claims as amended do not reasonably or logically follow from the cited references.

Each of Applicants' other independent claims includes, *inter alia*, elements similar to those of claim 1. Applicants' arguments with respect to claim 1 consequently apply to these other claims as well.

Applicants therefore submit that the Office Action has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully request the panel to withdraw the rejections and direct that a Notice of Allowance be mailed.

Respectfully submitted,

**McDONNELL BOEHNEN  
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP**

Dated: April 30, 2008

By: /David A. Grabelsky/  
David A. Grabelsky  
Reg. No. 59,208